

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

BCDC McATEER-PETRIS CONFERENCE ROOM
50 CALIFORNIA STREET
26TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013
6:30 P.M.

Reported by:
Ramona Cota

APPEARANCES

Board Members

John Kriken, Chair

Cheryl Barton

Ephraim Hirsch

Roger Leventhal

Jacinta McCann

Gary Strang

BCDC Staff

Brad McCrea, Regulatory Program Director

Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst

Ellie Knecht, Coastal Program Analyst

Ming Yeung, Coastal Program Analyst

Project Representatives

Andrew Fremier
Bay Area Toll Authority

Francis Lo
T.Y. Lin International

Sarah Kuehl
EINWILLERKUEHL

Andrew Wolfram
Perkins+Will

APPEARANCES

Public Commentors

Naomi Schiff
Oakland Heritage Alliance

Karen Hester
Scenic East Bay

Sandy Threlfall
Waterfront Action

John Klein
Scenic East Bay

Eugene Phillips

Bill Aboudi
Oakland Maritime Support Services (OMSS)

Dave Campbell
East Bay Bicycle Coalition

John Sutter
East Bay Regional Park District

André Carpiaux

I N D E X

	Page
1. Call to Order	5
2. Approval of Draft Minutes for August 5, 2013 and September 9, 2013 Meetings	5
3. Gateway Park, Gateway Park Working Group (First Review)	5
Introduction by Ellie Knecht, BCDC	5
Project Representatives	
Andrew Fremier	6
Francis Lo	7
Sarah Kuehl	9
Andrew Wolfram	12
Sarah Kuehl	12
Andrew Wolfram	13
Board Members' Clarifying Questions	14
Public Comment	
Naomi Schiff	22
Karen Hester	23
Sandy Threlfall	24
John Klein	24
Eugene Phillips	25
Bill Aboudi	26
Dave Campbell	26
John Sutter	28
André Carpiaux	29
Board Members' Discussion	29
4. Adjournment	40
Certificate of Reporter	41

PROCEEDINGS

6:34 p.m.

CHAIR KRIKEN: I'm going to call the October 7th meeting of the BCDC Design Review Board to order and the first order of business will be our minutes, the August 5th minutes to begin with. Are there any additions or deletions?

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: I'm happy.

CHAIR KRIKEN: None?

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: No.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Then may I ask all who approve to say aye, since we're on the microphone now.

(Ayes.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: All right. So the next step is the staff briefing.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Actually the minutes of September 9th as well.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Yes, two meetings.

CHAIR KRIKEN: That's right, I'm sorry.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Or perhaps that was for both.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. Then I'd ask the same. Are there additions or deletions to the September 9th minutes?

Not hearing any remarks I'll ask for your approval.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: So moved.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Say aye.

(Ayes.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

Now, may we begin?

MS. MIRAMONTES: So Ellie Knecht of our staff will present the project.

MS. KNECHT: So tonight we'll be hearing about Gateway Park, which is a new proposed regional park in Oakland near the location of the touchdown of the Bay Bridge. The park area includes about 170 acres from the shoreline adjacent to I-80 and connecting to Mandela Parkway in West Oakland. It offers a variety of amenities including a launch area for small boats, a fishing pier, new trail connections, open space and a variety of different sort of recreational and educational opportunities, which you'll hear a lot more about tonight.

We have asked you to consider six different issues in your review of the project, which are described in the summary. Those issues are:

Physical Access. So getting to the park and moving along the shoreline in the park.

Visual Access. That's views of the Bay, would they be maintained or preserved? There's a number of visual -- of vertical elements proposed with the project so how that would impact views of the Bay.

The Park Amenities.

Water Access. So the proposed launch areas for small, small boats.

Compatibility with Wildlife. So the public use of this area, the compatibility with wildlife, in particular the Emeryville Crescent on the north area of the site.

And then finally, sea level rise and how the project may evolve or withstand rising sea levels in this area.

And to present the project tonight we have Andrew Fremier with the Bay Area Toll Authority, Francis Lo with T.Y. Lin International who is a consulting firm on the project, Sarah Kuehl with EINWILLERKUEHL and Andrew Wolfram with Perkins+Will. Not necessarily in that order.

MR. FREMIER: Let me use the podium since it's here. So hi, my name is Andrew Fremier, I'm the Deputy Executive Director of Operations for the Bay Area Toll Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and I am really happy to be here to talk to you all about this project. It's interesting to hear it as a new project because I think for those of us that have been working on it for awhile, I think we're in year five and we are actually starting to see some movement. I think this is a pretty exciting time and I think it really kind of -- we recognized how important the project is once we opened the bike path to the Bridge and started to see its use.

So I am going to be extremely brief and then turn it over to the professionals that know a lot more about sort of the specifics and can kind of talk about the thoughts behind the project.

But I represent what we call the Gateway Park Working Group, which is nine public agencies that sort of represent everybody that owns a piece of property or has some responsibility in this area. And we have been working regularly for the last four or five years at sort of the deputy level. Brad is a member of it, we have got representatives from Caltrans, from the Port of Oakland, City of Oakland, and we work very hard at trying to make sure that what we are doing is trying to blur the lines of all the different projects that are there.

We also recognize it's a very difficult project to understand when you look at the project really prior to the Bridge opening. But with the Bridge opening, with some of the work we have done with Caltrans to sort of move their operation further east we are really starting to see the idea take hold. And one of the struggles that we have had from day one is to try to develop a concept that ensures people that we are not sort of inventing another Middle Harbor Park that is very hard to get to.

And I think the amount of activity that we have seen in the opening of the Bridge Project, recognizing that the public really can't get to the Bridge very easily today and yet they are still getting there. And so that, I think, was one of the first sort of real positive steps we have seen about making this concept very open and public and making people recognize, you know, what kind of an opportunity and what beautiful access is going to open up when the old bridge is removed and the bike path is completed, at least as far as Treasure Island.

I do want to make one more pitch before turning it to Francis and that is just a recognition that the Bay Area Toll Authority has also committed not only to the environmental document at this point for this project. We have also moved forward the concept of a bike path from Treasure Island into San Francisco.

(Applause.)

We are seeing these projects, I think, develop some life and we are certainly trying to at least identify what the needs are and what the wants are.

Both projects are extremely expensive and we do not have a full funding source for either one of them. But I think what we have decided and what we can show in today's presentation as the project develops, clearing it environmentally is the first big step but we do believe we'll be able to build it in incremental pieces that make a lot of sense. And each new

piece that gets added will really, you know, just point to the next opportunity and that's what we are hoping that you all see today and I think we are going to do a nice job in answering all the questions that staff brought forward for it.

So I am going to stick around for the whole show and be happy to answer any questions; and turn it over to Francis for the beginning part of the presentation.

MR. LO: Thanks, Andy. So first of all I think we'd like to thank you all for the opportunity to present to you what our thoughts are, and more importantly, we'd really like to get your input as we move forward. It is a big a project, there's a lot of moving pieces. Literally the ground is shifting under our feet as we are designing, because as you know, there is a lot of construction going on out in that area.

I am going to do a general description of the setting of the site; some of the issues that you guys brought up about physical access and compatibility with wildlife; I'll talk about a little bit of some of the more sensitive biological resources in and around the project site. And I'll touch about sea level rise a little bit but I'm sure you probably have more questions and, you know, we'd be more than happy to answer them later on after the presentation. And then Sarah Kuehl and Andrew Wolfram will talk a little more in detail about the specific design aspects of the park.

One of the unusual things that we are -- unusual approaches that we have taken in this park is we are dealing with a finite amount of public funds. And the project is going to be set up in a way that would promote public/private partnerships to leverage the use of public funds. So we are going to try and set up the job so that we would expect some charity, some kind of foundation to come in and support some of the operations.

And also we are looking for possible concession opportunities to add to the features that the park would provide to the public without requiring more additional public funding. So as we move forward with the project eventually coming to this body for permit approval and such in the future we'd be looking at really a fairly broad project, which -- even though it may only be constructed in phases.

So this is a location map of the site. What you're going to see is it's kind of like a midway stopping point between downtown Oakland and Treasure Island and then downtown San Francisco. Between the park and downtown Oakland and around the Lake Merritt area is about three and a half miles, four miles. Then it's another two and a half to Treasure Island and then another two miles to downtown San Francisco. What it really is telling us is that it's really a good midway point for people who want to bicycle from one location to the other. So that, you know, if they want to take a break and get some rest because the distance is too long for them, that's a good opportunity.

This is a plan of what we are looking at in terms of the park. We are going to divide -- we have kind of divided the park into different segments. The Link is really primarily a connection to the West Oakland community. And then the Bridge Yard is kind of an existing area that had been used as a bridge yard for the -- as a yard for the Key Train and Sarah is going to talk about it. And then the Port Playground, the Key Point, the Pier and Radio Beach, each has their own identity. And again, it will be discussed in greater detail later on.

But we are actually looking at constructing the project in different phases and this is kind of a preliminary phasing plan as to how we would move forward.

For those folks who aren't familiar with the site, just fairly quickly to talk a little bit about the existing conditions. On the north side of the -- of the toll plaza area, that's basically the riprap and some of the shoreline. And then you can see Radio Beach is kind of on the north side of the toll plaza. And then on the south side you can see the Pier 7 area down in that area. And then some of the existing buildings at the point. A number of buildings including one or two that actually has been considered as a historical structure.

CHAIR KRIKEN: May I ask, make the request anyway, to look again at your phasing. You went by that so fast.

MR. LO: Yes, okay.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Unless you're going to do more of it later.

MR. LO: Yes. We can come back to that.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

MR. LO: You want to talk about it now?

CHAIR KRIKEN: Well, wherever you think it fits in the story.

MR. LO: We can talk about it later after we've presented --

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

MR. LO: A little bit about the biological resources and constraints. I think one of the key points that you guys wanted to talk about is how does the project impact wildlife in the area. What we have done here is to identify some of the more sensitive resources. The bright green area is where colonies of Eel Grass were located in the past. And then the Emeryville Crescent on the kind of the top part of the area over there is also very sensitive in terms of birds and some other habitats.

So what we have tried to do is to make sure that we don't do anything that has any direct impact on those facilities. One of the aspects that we look at is where we are planting trees we want to be careful that we don't create a lot of sites and habitat for raptors so that they would go after the little birds at the Crescent.

A little bit about the connection. Again, it's another subject that I think you have indicated interest on. How do you get to and from the park? What we have done is kind of draw a little two mile radius around the park. Where you see the blue line, this little semicircle there. And within that area there are a number of significant bike paths and trails and that's one of the reasons why we have placed a pedestrian/bicycle bridge to connect to the confluence of three separate routes. And that is at the intersection of Grand Avenue and Mandela Parkway.

(Board Member Leventhal arrived and joined the meeting.)

And at the same time, it is within reasonably close proximity to a number of BART stations. And it is possible that as the park becomes operational and if there is an ability to generate sufficient funding then we may start to decide to run shuttles to the park to provide access.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I'm sorry, what was that last phrase? To provide shuttles --

MR. LO: So we may --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Shuttles to the park?

MR. LO: Shuttles to connect the park to the --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Thank you.

MR. LO: And generally we would like to promote non-motorized transport, if possible, because the park site is fairly linear and there is limited opportunity to provide parking so we want to provide better connections for non-motorized mode of transport.

Another item that we wanted to be mindful is it is really a good opportunity as an enhancement to the San Francisco Bay Water Trail. There are a number of Water Trail destinations in and around the area. You see all the red dots on the drawing there. So we definitely want to be able to enhance that opportunity.

And a very brief discussion on sea level rise. What we have done in this exhibit is to identify in the green line like a 2050 predicted sea level rise area and then the blue line is the 2100 predicted sea level rise. There are a number of sensitive sites within the project, specifically at the tip over here. There are a couple of East Bay MUD critical facilities tied in with the water treatment plant and so we would be doing something to protect those critical sites. There were another area on the south side and Sarah will talk about it in a little bit, where we have brought terraces where we would expect part of that to be at times flooded during heavy tidal events. And with that I want to hand it over to Sarah.

MS. KUEHL: Okay, great. Well I could not be more excited to be here. My name is Sarah Kuehl and I am with a firm called EINWILLERKUEHL. This park is really near and dear to my heart and I think an amazing opportunity for the East Bay/Oakland but obviously the larger East Bay community.

The park is unusual in some ways in that it is not a big, clean chunk of land that you are going to make a park in; it's a contemporary park that winds and wends around a lot of existing things and complex conditions. And I think it has a real opportunity for that reason.

It is also a very special park in that this piece of land, unlike a lot of other sort of brownfield sites, will always have an industrial context. It will always be bounded by a freeway and by the port. And I think it has a very special opportunity because of that to have some things happen here that you wouldn't want to have happen in a more pristine, natural environment.

So with that, I will basically walk us through the park from the east at Mandela and Grand to Key Point, which is the westernmost edge getting on to the Bridge, and talk a little bit more about what it's really like there, what kind of place is this.

One of the things we really noticed early in our site experience and which you will see woven through the whole park design is that it is very, very different when you're standing on the ground, when you can get up five feet, when you can get up ten feet and when you get up in the air. And for a landscape architect I think sometimes you have a hard time -- you all are more than qualified to understand this. But sometimes in meetings it's hard to get people to know what you're talking about, that the landscape is getting up five feet to where you really begin to perceive the hills and the basin. Getting up ten feet to where you can see the water, again, and begin to perceive it as sort of a larger body. And then getting up even higher and getting a bigger sense of long-distant views and so forth. And so a lot of what we have done to make the park experience, because it is long and narrow, is to move you up and down along the long and narrow trek.

The spine of the park really is driven by getting bicycles to and from the Bay Bridge. There is a pretty terrific path that has been put in now that goes from essentially the IKEA out

to the point at grade right along the freeway. And this is sort of the other path that will go to Mandela and Grand. And what the diagram is showing is that when you leave from the intersection and Mandela and Grand you go up in the air and you're on an elevated bike path that lands you then out into the park. And that elevated bike path has borrowed from some of the terrific industrial artists in the area, that's a Bliss Dance rip-off there and also some of Karen Cusolito's work. Basically saying that the character of that piece of the bike path should be different and should be part, perhaps, of the industrial art scene that we have there.

Then you land into the park at the Bridge Yard. You have some topography that's banking the back edge of it and you then begin to proceed up onto the Bridge. But all of those pieces taken together make for a pretty amazing experience of views - safety above all, getting out of the way of the rising number of trucks coming to and from the port - and I think a pretty terrific piece of wayfinding to tell people in cars or in other means where they're going.

So a little bit of detail about this. This is the intersection of Mandela and Grand, which I'm sure most of you know is actually the Bay Trail. And if you kept going down Mandela you eventually run basically into the West Oakland BART and up here is sort of our big box retail. This really gets you back to where people are and becomes the lift-off point for going on this elevated bike path into the park.

We have had amazing collaboration as we have been working on it where the truck stop that is being designed here with a biodiesel station for trucks and other facilities, food, the kinds of things, places to buy insurance, things you need if you're a trucker, has allowed us to land on the roof of their building. So one of our off points for this bike path will be on the roof of the truck facility, or it's certainly in the works to make that happen. That's a pretty great thing in terms of providing an active public space with eyes on the street, which I think is going to be important here, but also in terms of a lot of people can park their truck here and actually ride their bike if they want to and take the BART back to where they live in Dublin and not have to drive back and forth. So it's kind of trying to weave a lot of things together.

As you come down you land here, which is on segment two, which is the existing bike path into the park and we'll have a little bit of additional treatment as you go forward and get to the Bridge Yard, which I'll talk about next.

The other thing that we are trying to do here is this is the new road. This is Burma Road coming off of Maritime into the park. We have looked at saving some of the pieces of the old Bay Bridge to be a sort of series of gateways. So imagine five gateways as you enter into this park calling up the past, but also being a pretty narrow section a truck can drive under that can hold up to a pretty tough industrial context on all sides. So this element will provide wayfinding for someone coming in a car but will also be a pretty amazing destination trail as you begin to arrive at the park.

When you really feel like you've got somewhere and you are in the land of the park you're at the Sawtooth Building, which is the building you've probably seen a thousand times but may not have registered. It's the Inter-Electric Rail and Bridge Yard Shop Building where they used to service the old Key Trains and it's a really wonderful building, you can see it actually down here. It's recently been painted and made a lot nicer and the interior has been improved but it is really the first point at which we begin to have some land of any significance that we can occupy and make part of the park. It will not have any water access because the

port in development and a rail line serving a break bulk facility is all along this edge and that's something which has evolved as we have gone forward.

The thinking about the building is it's a special opportunity sort of wedged in here that might be a good place to do things in public space that are too big, too loud, too messy, too noisy, too whatever than you could do somewhere else. It's sort of a special park environment in that regard. And so it's drawing inspiration obviously from the Crucible and their activities but also from other projects that have re-purposed industrial spaces. What makes it really special is that it's on a road that has 280,000 cars a day. So it's a real billboard for some of these activities and that could be a terrific thing.

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER IN THE AUDIENCE: Wrong word.

MS. KUEHL: Sorry, wrong word. A good kind of billboard. Point taken.

So this activity which is more sort of rough and tumble in this area gives way to a more planted environment. And we imagine some of the large scale sculptures, perhaps some old trains, jumping over and also participating in this environment, but this giving way to the rest of the park. And the image that you see here is a small kind of resting area that was built for the bike path that should open soon. It's a good thing to go visit if you have a chance because when you get up you begin to see the environs there.

As you proceed further to the west you get into the real expanse of the park and being on the water and we have loosely termed this the Port Playground. The program for this area ranges from passive recreation to more active. So passive being picnicking, looking at bridges, perhaps looking at the view, shell collecting, which may or may not really happen there but playing in the sand. Kayaking, there would be a kayak beach launch there. This is the existing sandy beach, which is pretty terrific.

And then also could there be a pump track, building sort of on bicycle activities, could there be a zip line in the trees. And is this the right place, since we have moved more ride-like, like Ferris wheels, those sorts of things, out of a lot of places in the Bay Area, is this the right place given that it is loud and there's big cranes and other things to have a large scale ride that would allow you to get up and have a view, perhaps in some kind of industrial character.

All of these pieces sort of work together and there is a building in this area that I think Andrew will talk about in a minute that is located here as sort of a hub where you could perhaps store a kayak for the week so you could ride here on your bike, certainly get equipment to use, a large-scale climbing wall. And many of these elements I think we're talking about in terms of recreation, we are hoping to make industrial-size so that the presence in terms of being in this special area is partly about getting access and being small next to a very big thing and getting to see some of these things and use them.

This gives you a very preliminary sense of what it's like when you are on Kayak Beach in terms of looking up. And I think what's important to us at this point is that you are seeing Yerba Buena Island and the Bridge, you're seeing the trees that are sort of forming a back edge here hiding these existing billboards, giving you an edge to the water. We have terrace treatment, we have a sort of wall treatment. We have different kinds of treatments along here and then the beach itself and this thing is a very large scale climbing wall. But you get a sense of both a rhythm and a larger scale order of how these pieces go together.

One of the things we really noticed is that it's very, very different

MR. WOLFRAM: I'm Andrew Wolfram with Perkins+Will and I am just going to talk to you briefly about some of the buildings that will support the park functions. And what we have today are just some images, conceptual images of what the character might be like.

As Sarah said, the buildings are located at kind of key points throughout the park, kind of, in a way, if you think of it as the park being divided into thirds. So there is the Sawtooth building when you first arrive and then at sort of this third point you're getting to the next set of buildings which would be a park visitor center and services that would support the -- kind of the infrastructure of the park. So a place to store kayaks, a place for ticketing for some of the rides that Sarah has been describing, a small kind of snack shop and support services like restrooms. So these buildings are meant to be fairly industrial in character, meant to be fairly sculptural in character and be kind of a -- have a sort of playful impact. That they are kind of fitting into these parts of the park.

MS. KUEHL: Moving further to the west and to sort of the point. There's a couple of important things here. One is we have three historic buildings. The center one is really pretty terrific and has a great mezzanine level, wonderful architecture, good light. The two on the ends are more like bunkers, solid walls and a little bit of light at the top, but all have really great potential for us.

We see this area as sort of if you are coming along and you're tired coming back there's a ramp down, which is what this orange is, as sort of a place that you would get off, have a coffee, go to the bathroom, do all the things you need to do now that you've ridden back and forth across the bridge. And we've integrated that, really, into this. It has some terrific things which we'll show you in a more detailed point of looking back at the tower and doing some other things in terms of siting this in the landscape.

This becomes kind of a collection of things that do a very similar thing in one way to this project that you are all familiar with. And I think looking at a bridge, reusing historic buildings, having a place to show large scale sculpture. I recently got a postcard for a bike ride and large scale sculpture. It really does seem to be a program that is working for public space and getting these pieces together. It's also the part of the park that we see as being the link back to the how the engineering world and the natural world sort of interlock as they do everywhere. And so there are these existing pipes out on the site that are actually functioning now as tide pools and so we are recommending small areas of tide pools that we would construct in a similar manner that would serve as sort of an urban ecology annex.

We like the idea that if you come here you would recognize it as part of the family of the East Bay Regional Parks District, because they are a major player in this, but you would also maybe if you weren't inclined to be interested in nature this would be another way towards it as opposed to, I know I want to go see birds and that's what I'm going to do. It might be third down on your interests but it would be an opportunity to see it here.

For that reason we also want there to be a council ring but we're hoping it will be a sort of industrial arts, fire-breathing council ring of the special character that would happen at this park. So we imagine that there would be a lot going on in terms of the buildings, which Andrew will talk about more in terms of how they might get re-purposed over time but it would also serve this sort of general ecology which would then connect you back to the most

natural side of the project at Radio Beach underneath the Bridge here, which we'll talk about in a second.

This gives you an important sense of scale. So that's the existing bridge. You can then see two out of the three historic buildings, the edge of water and the pier going out in the background. It's very big and so it's helpful to kind of see the pieces put back together and kind of see how they are being integrated here.

This is a view from the new Bay Bridge showing kind of all of these pieces put together. I feel like it does a good, very shorthand job of telling the story of the park in terms of new things and old things, very large scale industrial things in views to big things far away, and a landscape that is programmed enough in terms of activities in the three buildings and outdoor art installation that it begins to be a dynamic place. Obviously this is very, very preliminary and there is a lot more to be done. But in terms of a kind of a place I think it begins to suggest it well.

MR. WOLFRAM: So the three remaining buildings at this end of the site, two of them are really important remnants of the industrial heritage associated with the Key Train system. They were substations for the Key Train system and they're kind of a little relic of what this site was historically and we think they're important to keep because they really add quite a distinctive character.

The idea is that one of them could become kind of a version of the warming hut, kind of a place that you get to, a destination. When you arrive there it would sell food, coffee and maybe have kind of other visitor services, books and postcards and things like that.

One of the other buildings is a windowless building that has a big skylight on top, it would make kind of an amazing gallery space just for large scale art. Something that you would just come in and come out of, just a very simple space.

And then the third building we're thinking would be a great place to have an artist studio for artists to come on sort of an interim basis to come and actually have a working studio in there that the public could come and visit.

So those are some of the ideas, very conceptual still about how we would reuse these existing buildings.

There is one other important piece of history. Oh, sorry, there is one other piece which is a new structure which would be a ranger station which would serve security needs at this part of the site because you are quite far out now from where you first arrived.

There is one other piece of history here that we have been developing some conceptual ideas about and that is the existing -- the old Bay Bridge now has -- is going to be demolished. And we are proposing that perhaps one section, the last section of the 288 -- there are two -- each of these last segments are called 288s, they're 288 feet long. So the idea that this very final segment could become an amazing belvedere to view the new bridge, to view the Bay, and that it would be kind of a little version of the High Line in kind of one short segment. That we would take the top deck off so that you are open to the sky on the lower deck and do some kind of a new surfacing there to address accessibility and guard rails. But that it gives you this great vista of the Bay Bridge. You're looking right at the tower when you get there. It's a fantastic promontory. So rather than building a new fishing pier we're suggesting that this is an idea, to build a new -- to reuse that one last segment of the bridge.

MS. KUEHL: And I'll add that is a topic we really need some input on if you have a strong opinion because there has been a lot of discussion about whether that conflicts with the new bridge. What happens to things like that that are sort of romantic ideas, over time. There are a number of us, including myself, we're pretty enthusiastic about it but it is by no means settled within the Gateway Park working group so it would be really helpful to have some professional thoughts about the 288.

So the last piece of the project is after you pass underneath the Bridge and wrap up to the north there is a pretty crazy area that I recommend going to as soon as possible before someone figures it out and closes it off, sort of in the short term. Which is, you can get off the Horseshoe Ramp that takes you back to Oakland, make a kind of weird dogleg and drive out and use this beach. It has terrific shells because no one goes here. It has fantastic views of the Golden Gate Bridge and it has a lot of nasty, invasive plants, dogs, old tires, so on and so forth.

That said, it is pretty striking from an experiential perspective and I would like to offer to take anyone on a field trip. The sound of the water as you hear the waves -- and you're standing right next to the toll plaza but you are completely transported to another place.

And our recommendation would be to use this in an appropriate manner. To come in and clean up. Between the maintenance road and the back edge of the beach there's kind of a slough condition here. Get rid of the invasive plants, make it a habitat buffer, really, to really make it, you know, the way you would want to see habitat, with some interpretations so people know not to go there, not to bring their dogs. And then also to have bike parking, have beach access. Not remove the wind surfing that's happening now but perhaps really limit the number of parking spaces and have this be somewhere that you can bike to from underneath the Bridge.

It does require that we have a certain amount of fill. So in order to make the connection, right now the condition is that the roadway comes up to a K-barrier and that pile of rocks. So it's basically right here and it goes straight down to the water. We would have to fill -- and there's different pros and cons from limited fill or should you do more fill to try to get more habitat. There's a lot of discussion about what's the best thing to do if you're going to do it. But the desire would be to have something that was a very limited trail, a little bit of buffer planting. Perhaps a bench or two along the way, but otherwise the bare minimum width that would allow people access to the north side.

And it really puts together the two sides of the Bay for public access but I think also psychologically when you're driving it helps you if you know that it's a park.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Is the dotted line the current profile?

MS. KUEHL: Yes, the dotted line is the current profile, the black dotted line.

So that said, we basically are here early because we think you all have a lot of knowledge and experience and we want to get early feedback and work it into the design.

And we could certainly go over the phasing now or we could talk for awhile and then go over the phasing but we hope to have a conversation. Thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. So before we ask the audience for comments I want to ask, does the Board have any clarification questions from this presentation they'd like to ask? Let's start with Ephraim.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes. I am not quite clear at all about access. You point out Mandela and Grand. Is that close to a BART station?

MR. LO: Let me try and explain it to you.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Do we have an access point close to a BART station?

MR. LO: I think we are roughly about two miles from a BART station.

MS. KUEHL: It's sort of equidistant to MacArthur BART and West Oakland BART and not, I would say, obviously near either one of them.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: So those are just kind of an arbitrary intersection?

MS. KUEHL: No, no.

MR. LO: No.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I mean, there is no parking there, I presume.

MR. LO: So let me try and specifically address that question. The City of Oakland has a fairly detailed bicycle plan. Some of the major routes include opposite the Bay Trail on Mandela. Grand Avenue is becoming one of the major bicycle paths and routes again. Then there was a third one which is Peralta, which doesn't show up very well here. So the connection -- the bridge that you heard Sarah talk about earlier really connects at about this point, which is really a confluence of three major routes within the city in terms of bicycle.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: But what about pedestrians? I mean, that's a long, long way to be walking before you get to the Bridge.

MR. LO: I think -- in all honesty in terms of pedestrians, it is a long walk. I think it's almost -- regardless of what route we provide it is a long walk. Which is why, as I mentioned earlier, one of the things that we would be looking at is as the park begins operation we would be looking at whether we could or how we could provide shuttles to either the West Oakland BART or the MacArthur BART, which is down here.

MS. KUEHL: I think there is a clarification too, which is I did not focus on it but there are 400 parking spaces in the park near the Bridge Yard and near the Port Playground area and there's another 200 overflow near Mandela and Grand. So there's --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: How do you get to them at the park then?

MS. KUEHL: How do you get to the parking spaces?

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes.

MS. KUEHL: Can we just flip to a plan and I can just point them out.

So there is parking -- well, there may be other parking but there is parking definitely located here, there is parking --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes, but how do you get to it?

MS. KUEHL: On Burma Road.

MR. LO: On Burma Road.

MS. KUEHL: There is a road that you can take, you can take. So this is it here. You can drive.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Let's say you're coming from San Francisco, how do you get there?

MS. KUEHL: If you're coming from San Francisco you get off on --

MR. LO: Grand Avenue.

MS. KUEHL: The Grand offramp, basically here. You take a right on Maritime, which is where we go to the Port, and you take a right on Burma Road and then come into the park.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And coming from the east?

MS. KUEHL: Coming from the east you can either do the same thing and move back around.

MR. LO: Take off at Grand Avenue.

MS. KUEHL: Or you can come down Mandela, which is a pretty well-used street or you can come up Grand, those are the two --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And from I-80?

MS. KUEHL: From I-80 you would, you'd have a choice but you would probably come this way and horseshoe back around like that.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I see.

MS. KUEHL: You could also get off and get into sort of this area and come around the other way but I think you'd probably do that.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And to get to Radio Beach?

MS. KUEHL: Existing, you can get to Radio Beach from right here. You see that little hook right there?

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes.

MS. KUEHL: That's the road. That's how you get there off of the same --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And from the new park?

MS. KUEHL: From the new park you could not drive there, you could only ride your bike.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Oh, you can get there that way, okay.

MS. KUEHL: You can only ride your bike there.

MR. LO: As a point of clarification, I think generally we are not trying to promote motorized access to Radio Beach.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: No, I wasn't asking that, just access in general.

MS. KUEHL: Yeah. No, no, good point.

I think the other thing that got lost a little bit in the access is that there is an awareness that it's too far to walk really, notwithstanding the people who are doing it now, there's about 450 people an hour on the weekends. But it's too far to walk. It's a great biking distance. And we have been showing on these plans which you can't see there but you can see up close, there's sort of a quarter-mile grid. This is the right distance for all the people who live in the flat lands to come to a regional park on a bicycle. And that is becoming more and more the norm in the East Bay and we have been working with the City of Oakland on the increase in bicycles as a modality of transportation and it's just going up and up and up. So we have a lot of reason to believe people will bike to this park and use it as a family destination.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: What about air quality with all that crossing truck and parking and industrial?

MS. KUEHL: So that has been a big concern, obviously. I think there has been a recent report, and Richard is here, I think, that there have been some improvements at the Port. In terms of wind direction, the wind is going like that so our real concern is actually the particulate matter coming off of 80 itself.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I was thinking crossing all the industrial area.

MS. KUEHL: Yeah. I mean, I'm an optimist. I really believe that we are doing the things we can. These trees are going to help with it. But I also believe that things are trending

in the right direction where air quality is getting better at the Port and cars are getting better, so you have to think about it in the hundred year perspective of you want to secure the land, make a great park and then continue to work on those problems.

MR. LO: And Sarah, should we show the slide on the lungs. We do have it in the back so let me --

MS. KUEHL: I don't think it's important, Francis.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Okay, thank you.

MS. KUEHL: Sure.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Could you just point out the bicycle access from the north or northeast. There is that light yellow line there, I'm just wondering how you get on that?

MS. KUEHL: So right now this is 40th Street, which is sort of the Home Depot street and this is the new Target. And right now you come around this way and you can actually duck under either side of it. But you start at IKEA, which is here, and it comes underneath the freeways here and it's at grade. And it keeps going and it keeps going and it keeps going in a straight line all the way out and up.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Will that be maintained?

MS. KUEHL: That will be maintained.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Cheryl?

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: I just had all those questions. The only other one, just to confirm. The only access from south to north is via bicycle or probably walking, but just bicycle?

MS. KUEHL: Yeah. You could drive and get off on the north but the only way to get --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: To link the park pieces.

MS. KUEHL: Yeah, it's no cars. There's a no cars -- actually there might be a shuttle.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: That's good.

MS. KUEHL: But there's no cars west of that point right now. Which has been a big conversation, as you might imagine, with a design team.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: I think it's great. I'm watching the character of that experience. You know, who is experiencing it and how does it feel?

CHAIR KRIKEN: Jacinta.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: I had the same question as you, John. If we could go back to phasing. I wanted to understand the phasing more clearly. And could you also comment on ideas you have had about interim uses, so pre, like Phase Zero or pre-uses and how that activation may help the park?

MR. LO: Let me try and address a little bit of that first and then Sarah will chime in. As we are looking at the phasing there are a number of considerations. Money is one, permitting and getting approval is another one. Obviously we would like to see some of the improvements being constructed and completed and open to the public as soon as possible. And then a third and fairly important consideration is the availability of the land.

As I think we all mentioned earlier, the East Bay Regional Park District is a very significant partner in the project. They are bringing forth a significant chunk of the land around this area, which is land that would be transferred over to the park district from the Army. And

right now even though the Army has a tentative schedule as to when they would transfer there are a number of uncertainties.

So as we develop a plan we kind of try and roll those things into the mix but at the same time we are very mindful about the user experience. And so as we are looking at the phasing, throwing all those considerations into the mix, we wanted to do that in such a way that is very progressional so that, you know, it becomes very rational. And Sarah, you want to talk about how we move from one phase to another?

MS. KUEHL: Sure.

MR. LO: In the sense of moving and progressing.

MS. KUEHL: Yeah. I mean, I think the first thing is that the bike path comes first; there's two reasons for it. One is I think there is just a question of fairness to the north and the south, to Oakland and to Emeryville and the East Bay. Right now if you're from Oakland you have to do this, come up, go over, come back down to get on here. Grand Avenue is a major bikeway. Dave Campbell from the East Bay Bike Coalition is here, I'm sure he could speak to that as well. But this is really about having it be fair and having it be like the two sides to the freeway offramp and it has to go in.

It potentially can also go forward on a different environmental process and go faster so there's some benefit to that. In terms of the other pieces, I actually, from a landscape architect perspective, have a little bit of mixed feeling about the order because in some ways you really need to be sure there is a there, there. But makes sense in terms of when the land will come along.

So to speak more to your second point, this is already being activated. The building has sort of already been upgraded, there is a terrace here that I think will be a big amenity. There are some things beginning to happen. This is a logical second piece in terms of land transfer but not a logical second piece in terms of program, so one thing we have been talking about in the design team is how to get enough program. And we are actually re-looking at the design a little bit so that there is enough going on.

I think the big benefit to this green piece is it's really hot right now and really pretty tough. So coming into a bosque of trees after you've walked from IKEA, which people really do, which is remarkable, would feel wonderful and would feel like you were off the highway. So there is some benefit here I think in terms of that, but not in terms of activity. So we're relying on this Bridge Yard piece for activity, this in terms of the landscape experience.

Then this piece, which would follow, I think is a natural because I think you see it, it has the great view of the Bridge, it's the point, the last piece of land, it makes a lot of sense to do it. This will be the hardest piece of land to get transferred, probably because of the sediments in the water, not actually because of the land. So it will be slow in coming. And since it's about the water access I think there is some question. We might -- if I get my way we jigger the diagram the little bit so maybe the green pops over a little bit and we begin to have a little more program on the bluff area. But I think that's kind of how the sequence works.

And this piece is left. I think it's tricky but I also think it's going to require the most collaboration in terms of the environmental community dealing with sea level rise, a number of things where people really have to come together. I think it's really important but I think

people want to make sure we get it right. And there is a larger study going on about sea level rise right now out on the streets so I think it needs to be part of that so it's a little bit delayed.

MR. FREMIER: Sarah, do you mind if I?

MS. KUEHL: Please.

MR. FREMIER: I'd like to jump in a little bit on this. So absent any discussion on the park, what happens is over the next six months or so we finish the completion of the east end that is currently a temporary bike path connection to the Bridge. So that work gets completed with the finishing up of the east end of the Bridge construction. So in six months or so we should be on a permanent structure from the park area to the Bridge.

There is another 18 month or so to two years on the west end where the deconstruction of the existing bridge and the reconstruction of the new ramp from the island connect the bike path permanently to the island. So over the next two years what you're really going to have is a morphing of a temporary bike path that ends at the tower to a completed bike path from IKEA, as Sarah represented, and then also out here at Maritime, all the way to Yerba Buena Island, with belvederes and places to stop and some intermittent parking and places like that.

There's several other committed projects, though, that I think are really important to recognize that the development of the park starts to take place with that completion of the bridge project and the removal of the existing bridge. Because then you do start to open up this area and you already have access.

We have talked quite a bit about this Bridge Yard building and it really is a fascinating building. Right now it's slated to be a Caltrans maintenance facility. We have been successful, I think at the working group level, at really changing the approach that Caltrans has had in this area and it was going to be the centerpiece of their maintenance village. We bought land from Oakland, BATA, the Bay Area Toll Authority, and they are moving their maintenance complex east.

We have a programmed project that is funding the retrofit and reconstruction of this Bridge Yard building to the point of sort of a decision where it is going to be seismically retrofit, the occupancy rating will be changed and it will be really available at that point in time to be a park amenity if we can figure out a way to sort of make that transfer.

But again, even absent that conclusion, we have a public parking area here that is underway. We have, as Sarah mentioned, a terrace that sort of is a really nice stopping point. We anticipate moving the public information office into this building so that the restrooms can be publicly accessible. There will be some programming available to the public. And again, sort of acting as a centerpiece between this two mile trek from IKEA to the Bridge, you've got sort of a waystation.

So again, absent any movement of the park we think we have a couple of cornerstones that sort of lay out something much better than what we currently have when you look at it today.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Great, thank you. I think I'm letting this drift a little too much.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Go ahead.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Let's go faster now.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Three questions and you can be as quick and succinct as you'd like.

MS. KUEHL: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: On the Radio Beach cross-section where this new bike trail --

MS. KUEHL: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: You're talking about fill. And I don't see a cross-section line so I'm wondering, you know, can this be -- I see, you know, an area of green requiring fill to move the trail out over. You know, are there -- can this -- or have you looked at moving this closer? Is this the minimum fill necessary, is always the question I ask. Can you move the bike path closer?

MS. KUEHL: You can get rid of the landscape buffer and have less fill, yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Right, and then have -- okay, so there are some options there for the bike path.

MS. KUEHL: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: The second question. Thank you for that, thank you for that.

MR. McCREA: Roger, one point.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Oh, sure.

MR. McCREA: You walked in after there was some --

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah, I was a little late, sorry.

MR. McCREA: -- design analysis with regard to Eel Grass beds and what-not so later on you may want to lead back to that.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Okay, I will. Because I have been to Radio Beach, actually several times, so I know that very well. But I thought that was more on the other side but I have been there too.

MS. KUEHL: There is a big Eel Grass bed to the north.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Okay. But to the extent -- I don't know if that affects where the bike path can be and where the fill needs to be but maybe I'll come back.

On page 14, this Gateway Park. I just want to get a little more understanding of tidal terraces and the edge of this urban beach. I don't know if I missed that too. I apologize, there was terrible traffic today in Marin.

MS. KUEHL: That's okay. Any detail about it. Basically

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I mean, do you have walls along that edge? That's my question, I guess.

MS. KUEHL: We do in one location, some urban beach. Yeah, we have a seawall.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Okay. Okay. So you're adding sea walls. Because that's in the BCDC area.

MS. KUEHL: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: And are these urban terraces existing or are they --

MS. KUEHL: No, we are terracing the land and raising the grade to get to a grade that will be protective.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Okay, okay. So it's more of an architectural feature, not a restoration feature per se, okay.

MS. KUEHL: The terraces have the potential to do restoration.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah.

MS. KUEHL: It's unclear whether you would do it in that

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I assume this is a pre.

MS. KUEHL: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I'll have a lot of questions when the design comes through.

MS. KUEHL: Yes, yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: How that would work.

And I guess finally I would have a question of your sea level rise numbers. They seem a little on the low side. And they seem like even -- I assume these are preliminary. The elevations you are at now on a storm would even maybe get overtopped. So maybe we can go into that a different day but --

MS. KUEHL: Yeah, that's a huge conversation. In the end I will just say that we used the numbers that we all came to but it is a big conversation and we would like to keep that --

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah. I'd like to get more details on that.

MS. KUEHL: Yes, be happy to --

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Because to me they seem a little on the low side.

MS. KUEHL: Okay.

CHAIR KRIKEN: I have one just quick question to ask you and that is, did you consider or have you considered the bicycle rider as your prime user for the open space?

MS. KUEHL: Yes.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Is there a second tier of --

MS. KUEHL: User?

CHAIR KRIKEN: User that you discovered?

MS. KUEHL: Yeah. I mean, I think the thing about bicycle riders, and I didn't include the slide but I have a slide that shows 20 different kinds of bicycle riders. And so our interest is that there is the bicycle rider you picture who has the nice bike and the tight shorts, but when you begin to sort of think about bicycle riders in Oakland, there is somebody carrying a two-by-four on a gold-painted bike that's falling apart. There's families with three and four kids.

In the East Bay, and I really can speak to it because I live really near here, bicycle riding is all the things people do in cars. So it's bicycle riders but it's somebody who is riding their bike to come fishing, somebody who is riding their bike to come to a gallery, someone who is riding their bike because they're training and they want to do a loop to the island back because it's the right distance. So it's bicycle riders but it's not for biking necessarily. Biking is a way of getting there and there are some special things you can do.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

MS. KUEHL: And actually if I can echo one other thing about that too. I think we do recognize you've got different type of bicycle riders. Some that I simply just call professional riders, I mean folks like Dave Campbell in the audience.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am not a professional.

(Laughter.)

MS. KUEHL: And then we've got the leisurely, you know, the family taking the kids out riding their bike on the weekends. So in terms of the design I just want to point out that what

we have started off with originally was we were just going to have essentially one, single, major bike route through the park.

And as we started looking at the project we kind of come to the conclusion that the right thing to do is kind of how we have been dealing with our highway system. And I am exaggerating here and excuse me for doing that but we've got a freeway that is a real, direct connection between the Bridge and all the destinations outside, through the park and outside of the park. And then we've got like a local street thing that kind routes through the different park facilities. So that we can accommodate both the professional bikers, again I use that term loosely here, along the yellow path. And then we've got the other path to cater to the leisurely uses.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay, thank you.

I would now like to open the discussion up to the audience. How many people would like to say a word?

(Show of hands.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay, four, five. Try to keep it in the realm of four to five minutes at the outside.

NAOMI SCHIFF: All right, I am going to stand over here and bellow so you can hear me.

I'm Naomi Schiff, I'm on the board of Oakland Heritage Alliance. We have voted, as has the Sierra Club, to encourage people not to put a lot of billboards in our new park and around it. And I have a copy of the Sierra Club letter here for you, which was addressed to our state legislators because a lot of people have control of different pieces of this. We are really interested in speaking to Caltrans about not placing billboards. There are three already there and there are between two and five more planned.

On your plans you can see where two of them are. But on page ten where you see the bike riders' view of things the new billboards aren't there, you can't see them. And so they actually show what we want to have happen, which is no new billboards; however, there is some doubt about that.

I just want to address a couple of related things and then I know the bicycle folks have lots of things to say. These aren't just any old billboards. These are lit up LED, changeable message, two-sided billboards and they are likely to blast additional light into your wildlife areas. They will also affect views from the park and to the park or of the park. The extant billboards are clearly visible from Treasure Island, I went out and photographed them from there. And if you would like we could e-mail you our presentation about these billboards.

It is also true that another weird item of billboard conflict is trees. There are famous cases which you can find on the Scenic USA website about billboard companies deciding that they have a conflict with trees because trees sometimes impair visibility of the important messages.

And then trying to be brief here a little bit. I just want to talk about historic buildings for a moment, which is what my organization originally focused on. We didn't want a lot of billboards next to that glorious Key System building with the sawtooth roof. That is a really great building. And thinking about the Key System I would just like to throw an idea out there

for you which is that another link on the Key System was the 16th and Wood train station, which is in West Oakland.

It's a little bit further towards the historic waterfront than Mandela Parkway, but boy would it make a great place to rent a pedi-cab if you wanted to get a family out there with muscle power rather than even somebody who didn't have a bike. And I don't know if any of you have ever been in Santa Barbara but probably you have and you have probably seen what goes on on their coastal cement path there along the palm trees beach in Santa Barbara. But it's heavily populated by a local small business which is renting those four-person pedal-powered vehicles and gee, that would be a whole, great thing to do here and I've got a building for you where you could park that business.

There is one other building I just want to offer to the folks who are interested in buildings, and it even comes with a small amount of money. And that is, Building 812 on the Oakland Army Base, which is a wonderful historic building, up until now inhabited by film companies. They need to get it out of the way. There is a little bit of money that could maybe go towards moving it. It is part of the EIR for the Army Base mitigations and we would very much like to see that building preserved. It would probably be silly to move it all the way out near the other old buildings, it might be a useful structure down towards the Burma Road/Maritime end of things. It's very close to that, it's really a very short distance away. It's a really cool building, you guys, made out of virgin redwood and I would be happy to send pictures to everybody involved if you would like to see what it looks like.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Sure.

MS. SCHIFF: Thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: E-mail us.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Who is next?

MS. HESTER: I'm Karen Hester. I'm a semi-professional bicyclist, only because I bike every day but I am definitely a professional billboard dissident, I hate these things.

So we formed Scenic East Bay about a year ago. I just want to make sure everybody understands that this has passed the City of Oakland and it is now going to go to Caltrans for approval, so this is where we can stop it. As Naomi was just talking about, you know, this beautiful sawtooth building, that's --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I'm sorry, what passed the City of Oakland?

MS. HESTER: The five billboards passed. It was included in the Army Base deal. So there's going to be three digital billboards and two static billboards unless we stop it.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I see.

MS. HESTER: It's up to all of us to stop it.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: It passed Oakland, okay.

MS. HESTER: Yeah. And it's going to pollute this beautiful, world-class park. And it is so exciting to see these designs today but, you know, the billboards, we are not seeing a lot of visualization of the billboards. And I have been on the bike path four times, I love it, I go from, ride from 45th and Broadway. And as you go up, you know, you're having this incredible world-class experience and all of a sudden I am being barraged by these horrible digital

billboards. So it just kind of breaks my heart to think that I may have to look at, you know, three to five more of them as I am going on this bike path.

So I just want to make sure people understand there is a campaign here. We have 3,000 signatures of people who are opposing this. We are going to keep fighting very, very hard and that's why we are at these kind of public meetings. We have met with your state legislator, you know, aides from the state legislature as well. So just anything we can do to keep this a world-class experience and it's such a beautiful park.

I'd also, just to say to Sarah, that I do like the idea of the old bridges as a pier.

MS. THRELFALL: Hi, my name is Sandy Threlfall and I'm with Waterfront Action. And I have a lot of history with this park. Richard Whitney and I brought John Sutter out Burma Road when it was still the Army Base and said, wouldn't this be an incredible park? And dear, dear John Sutter said, yes, it would. And thank God for public benefit conveyance, East Bay Regional ended up with a piece of it.

What I am very excited to see in the presentation tonight, because we have had a couple of interim meetings, probably the last meeting was two years ago, was that Caltrans or someone said, no trees because it blocks something. And in this presentation I am seeing trees, which I think are a very basic necessity coming back to air quality and noise. Trees do modify noise.

It's exciting and I am hoping that it will come back to you a couple more times because I continue to be impressed with your feedback. Thank you very much.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

Who is next?

MR. KLEIN: We're waiting for a slide here.

My name is John Klein and I'm with Scenic East Bay. I live in Alameda.

One thing I wanted to point out. Your presenter mentioned the access from IKEA but there is also a second trail head on Maritime over here that's more accessible from West Oakland BART than the IKEA point and it also has other uses there.

So the irony here -- about being here about the billboards is that actually the City of Oakland has very strong anti-billboard laws and five have been approved and more are coming. So we don't know what to say about that other than we don't want any more billboards.

But I agree totally with the direction that you are going in making the Gateway Park a destination.

Scenic East Bay is actually working to expand that idea of it being a destination, both the Gateway Park and the Bridge, out more along the bike trails. And so when I pointed out to you the other trail head that is on Maritime, for example, there's -- right at the trail head there there's about a one acre empty vacant lot.

And so what we are proposing is, again, expanding that view of it as a destination. That there be -- there are various bits of property all along those trails that currently are either vacant lots or they have storage containers and they just look like junk. Where they can be cleaned up and used as parkettes, rest stops, bicycle rentals. The area of the trail head at Maritime is large enough where it could -- you could put food trucks there. In other words, adding value to the bicycle trail, which ultimately leads to the destination, making the destination of Gateway Park and the Bridge more inviting.

It also provides an alternate economic development strategy there rather than just plopping some billboards down as a cash machine. Billboards are unpopular, they will degrade the views, they will degrade the open space qualities of the park. As one of your presenters said, the area is always industrial, it will always be industrial. But I think nothing screams industrial louder than large digital billboards. And we certainly don't want them screaming that at the park, okay.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Would you mind pointing to the zone of the billboards.

MR. KLEIN: They are currently plopping -- they are currently along here. A couple more new ones are proposed here and then further along the freeway.

CHAIR KRIKEN: So it's starting all the way back to the park area and going forward.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: The Sawtooth Building is at location number one, the new one.

MR. LO: There is one around here.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: A little bit to the right of this one.

MR. LO: There's another one over here.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Okay, all right.

MR. KLEIN: Actually it's not in the Sawtooth Building, it's up in the Caltrans maintenance.

MR. McCREA: Andy, if you want to stand up and share what you know.

MR. FREMIER: It's been a long time since I have actually looked at it but we have got several that are down in this area. Those already exist right? There's, I think, a red dot. There's several of them there. What is proposed is another one right here next to the Caltrans maintenance village and then back along sort of the West Grand and 880 area.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: They're outside the park boundary?

MR. FREMIER: Yeah, they're outside of the park.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: The existing one.

MS. KUEHL: They interface with the bike path that we would like to consider part of the park but with the park lands there are not -- there are no new ones in the park lands.

MR. KLEIN: What we would like to ask you is that you raise this concern. We'd like to bring this concern to you about the billboards in relation to the park and that you would raise these concerns in your interactions with the City of Oakland and any of the other jurisdictions there. Thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Next, please.

MR. PHILLIPS: Hello. My name is Eugene Phillips and I'm an artist. And I guess I'll change the tone just a little bit from billboards to big art.

I think this is a great opportunity to create some really exciting designs. And I think the local artist community is really excited about being a part of it and to have a place for showing large-scale sculpture and art within other functional elements, drinking fountains, lighting systems, et cetera, et cetera. So I hope that you will explore and be excited by this creative process yourselves.

I did years ago, about two years ago in talking to Bart Ney I got a tour of the site of the bridge and so I did a little design piece. And what I would like to do is actually drop one over here. Using a large chunk of the bridge. And after going to meetings I see that this could be

interpreted many different ways. I think it's an opportunity to use some of the steel from the bridge.

So I will just kind of say thank you for considering art and making it a part of this project and this could be very exciting, thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Does that -- oh, sorry.

MR. ABOUDI: Good evening. My name is Bill Aboudi, I'm with OMSS, Oakland Maritime Support Services. We have actually been negotiating with the City of Oakland since 2007 on the 15 acres that was mandated by BCDC, thank you very much. We are actually -- this is our design right here. And right now the bike path is actually on our old -- on our future site. Burma Road goes this way. We were just evicted from this section here and we are temporarily located on the lot to come back to develop this and this area here. This is a BCDC-required 15 acres.

We have been -- actually our architect has been communicating with the project and we expressed willingness to work with them on the bike touchdown. We have -- our development is mostly for truckers and it services the truckers that serve the Port of Oakland. But in the beginning portion here there is a food court and it's a car facility that we don't use on the weekends. The truckers usually work Monday through Friday so the weekends we have plenty of parking and we have food courts that our tenants will be leasing, which would be perfect for this. And definitely consideration of a bike shop would be great.

We do have one billboard that is not our choosing that would be taking some of our parking spaces in the middle of our site. That was put in there, we didn't pick it. But we will have bikes all over the place. And truckers did reduce PM by 50 percent the first year that CARB put in, I guess, their regulation and we are on our way to reduce 85 percent PM by 2020. Actually we'll probably be doing a lot more than that.

But we're more than happy to work with BCDC and any agencies that are working on this and we also thank you for mandating the 15 acres, otherwise they wouldn't exist.

MS. MIRAMONTES: I feel like I should just briefly explain that. In the Seaport Plan there is a requirement, and I don't know the details of all of it, but there is a requirement that there be 15 acres allotted for truck parking associated with the Port uses. I don't know if you have any more on that.

MR. McCREA: It's actually 30 acres, it's 15 on City property and 15 on Port property.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay.

MR. McCREA: And Ellie can explain it further.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: And PM means?

MR. McCREA: Particulate matter.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Particulate matter.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Thank you. I knew it was an air quality something.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I thought it was parts per million.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Well, that's PPM.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Oh, PPM. It's missing a P.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Good evening. My name is Dave Campbell; I am the Advocacy Director of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition.

I want to first thank BCDC for mandating that the bike path from Emeryville IKEA to the new Bay Bridge bike path be included in the Cypress Project. I think it was mitigation for it. You get credit for that or for requiring that so thank you for doing that.

And in connection with that I do want to take this opportunity to thank Andy and his team at MTC and Francis at T.Y. Lin, Lee at the Bay Trail, ABAG, Steve from Caltrans. These folks are all on a first name basis with me now because they're my buddies. They built a beautiful bike path out on the Bay Bridge and opened it on Day 1 when it was open to cars so thank you very much. And this park is going to be a great connection to that wonderful bike/ped bridge.

So real quick I want to just highlight some of the things we like. I often get to come up here and say what I don't like about projects and pick them apart. You guys are taking all the fun out of this.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMPBELL: This is an awesome project; this project kicks butt and we really like it. The connection to Mandela is great. The fact that this bike/ped connection is a high priority and is almost fully funded to date is great news. Running it off the top of a building sounds way cool, I like that.

For those of you who don't know, I think in your packet there's a map that shows the bike plan for the City of Oakland. By the time this park is done pretty much every red line is going to be done as a new bikeway in Oakland connecting this -- connecting the neighborhoods of West Oakland and Downtown Oakland to this bike path. So we're going to have great bike access getting to West Oakland, getting to the Mandela Parkway, getting to the takeoff point for the bike/ped bridge to Gateway Park and to the Bay Bridge, so that's great news.

What else do I like? The statues look awesome, keep those. The terrace that's being put in at the Sawtooth Building and the renovation of the Sawtooth Building is wonderful, I love that.

All the trees, we like trees, bicyclists like trees. Just in case you don't know, bicyclists do not like billboards, we are anti-billboard, okay. Put us down, put us down as a "no" for that.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't know if the truck -- the truck guy made his point clear but I think they are "no" on the billboards as well too if you're keeping score.

But I do want to take my final moment here to underscore the importance of the old bridge. We fought as the East Bay Bike Coalition way back since the late 1990s for bike access on the Bay Bridge. And as much as we love the new bridge and the symbol that it is of the achievement that we've had, the old bridge is really very much a part of that achievement for us. So when I see the old bridge and then I see the new bridge it helps me to see the old bridge for us to understand the importance of what we have achieved in getting that bike path on the new bridge.

And for those of you who don't know, the MTC commission had voted unanimously not to put the bike path on the bridge at one point in time. Within a year or so, under pressure from many points, they voted unanimously to do it. So the old bridge plays a role in that kind of in our history so I love the idea of keeping a segment of the old bridge as part of a pier or keeping some of the structure elements as the gateway to Gateway Park. I think that's great. It does

mean a lot to us so I hope you'll consider that in your deliberations for how the park will be finally designed.

And thank you, Sarah, for all your work on this and bringing forth a wonderful project.

MR. SUTTER: Good evening. I'm John Sutter, I am Chair of the Board of the East Bay Regional Park District and of course we have a great interest in this project. And the speed at which it moves is indicative of how government works. When Sandy Threlfall brought me out to see the Oakland Army Base that was 17 years ago so it takes a while.

Some of the -- We have discussed this at our board level. The Board has not made any commitment. We have made a commitment to the extent that the part of the land that we will get from the federal government is certainly something we have committed to develop a park on, that's the western-most portion. Roughly from here west is the land that we will get from the federal government and we will also get some from state agencies. And we have committed and we have passed a bond issue. East Bay voters passed a bond issue in 2008 which provides funding for the construction of park features out there.

Initially our concept was a fairly passive-type park, similar to some of our other shoreline parks. For example, Coyote Hills in Fremont or Pinole Regional Shoreline in Richmond or similar to the City of Berkeley's Cesar Chavez Park. A place where there would be -- you could walk, enjoy the views, take a hike, maybe bring out a picnic, but not high-level activity things. This was the initial concept, we are not -- we don't have our feet stuck in this.

We weren't talking about Ferris wheels or towers, large towers which would have elevators in them to take you up to see the view, or a velodrome. That was another idea that was floated for awhile, a bicycle velodrome. Or moving sidewalks. Fortunately, some of those ideas have been discarded.

And by the way, I do want to compliment the consultants. I think they have done an excellent job and they floated a lot of ideas but what's before us now is more practical than some earlier ideas. But anyway, I think they've done a wonderful job of looking at all the options and I think that it provides great opportunities for East Bay residents and Bay Area residents.

Some areas I would like you to focus on are the point. How intensive should be the development at the point? The photos there look like there will be a lot of hardscape out there. The idea of having manmade tide pools is kind of interesting but you're sort of destroying the natural landscape to do that. Maybe that's better to do somewhere else.

Some of the sports activities, the extreme sports activity. Does that belong out there or would that be better somewhere else?

So anyway, whether it should be a passive park or a more active park I hope you take that into consideration and give us your thoughts on that. Especially at the Point, that's a very key area. Should that be more natural or should it have a lot of manmade structures there?

Another key point I think is the connection to Radio Beach. The idea is to go under the bridge as was explained to connect to Radio Beach. It could be a very interesting experience. We'd appreciate your thoughts on that. It's controversial. Audubon and other groups like that may oppose it but it certainly has other environmentalists who will support it. But anyway, I think that's another feature.

Parking. I think a lot of people are going to come out there with their cars. They may put their bikes on their bike racks and park as close as they can get, take the bike off and then get on the Bridge. Or if you're going just to take a look, take a hike and have a picnic or something you're probably going to come out in an automobile. So how about the parking? Is it adequate? Is it in the right places? Is there too much, too little, et cetera? Those are issues which we are dealing with and we would appreciate your advice. Thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Okay.

MR. CARPIAUX: In the absence of a microphone I am going to try to speak as loud as possible.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Caltrans and the other people here. My name is André Carpiaux, I live in Emeryville and have witnessed the evolution of the Bridge.

I come here to talk about an issue that is not popular and that is the issue of the homeless. And I am shocked of the amount of money we are going to spend to destroy the bridge. And when I made a correspondence with one of the colleague I call it we are all junkie. That we are here to destroy. And it takes so much money and effort to build something and now we are going to trash it. And when I ask what's going on they say, oh, don't worry, it's already been cut down, you know. People are working day and night to make trash out of it and this is, this is a real waste. I'm really upset about it.

We live in a culture of fun and entertainment. And we have here a beautiful piece of art, a beautiful piece of engineering that is unique. Normally those unique pieces are like a unique car, they go into a storage for display, a museum. And here we already are engaged in cutting it down and this is real bad.

And we have also another thing that we forgot beside the homeless. The use of the bridge, the old bridge like it is here. It was good yesterday. And because we have a new one it's no good so we have to shut it down and that's not right. You see we use -- we can use the upper deck for sightseeing and we could use the lower deck for to place the homeless. There we have a whole apartment that is all made, all we need to do is run the sewer line.

And we are have a nation of homeless here, they have no place to go. It's easy to deal with the homeless that are immigrant. We ship them back overseas, deport them. But those who have no place to go, we're stuck with them and it costs lots of money. And now we are going to build housing for them. Well, we already have a building that is all made.

I would like to correspond with you. I don't want to bore you with my philosophical talk. But if you care to give me your e-mail I could make an elaborate plan and all to show we have a serious social problem and we have to look into it. Thank you.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

That concludes the audience comments. We will now begin the board discussion. Some of you know that this is the time we talk between ourselves and we may ask a few questions along the way but that's what we will be doing now. Who would like to begin?

Or actually let me -- the staff has provided an agenda of the -- it includes visual access, proposed park amenities, the specific questions they had. They had water access, wildlife compatibility, sea level rise.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Physical on the first page.

CHAIR KRIKEN: The other one is physical access, okay.

And I should maybe for the audience simply remind everybody that our purview is the physical and visual access to the Bay shoreline. We can't deal with -- I mean, we can talk about some of the other things that have been raised today but that is really the core of our --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: And from the Bay.

CHAIR KRIKEN: And from the Bay, that's true. Okay.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Well, I think my questions, you know, for me the concern about the physical access. I don't think it's quite clear yet, you know, the obvious way to get there or the easiest way to get there. Perhaps that will be cleared up in the future presentations. I don't know if the other members of the Board feel that way as well.

CHAIR KRIKEN: I think it is difficult and it will remain difficult. There is not --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: There's an awful lot of stuff

CHAIR KRIKEN: I don't mean difficult.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: -- between --

CHAIR KRIKEN: I mean it's not clean.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Right. Between the city or the freeway and the park there's an awful lot of stuff in-between that you have to get through.

CHAIR KRIKEN: It is a good point to raise in terms of wayfinding, though, to sign it well.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Signage, yes.

CHAIR KRIKEN: So that we -- so that by car and by foot and by bike --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: By signage, that's not billboards, that's signage.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes, please.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: By the way, billboards. Whatever this is naive. Whatever happened to Lady Bird Johnson's ban on billboards within the side of freeways?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: I don't know.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: You're dating yourself.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I am.

MS. HESTER (FROM THE AUDIENCE): There's a federal lawsuit right now just about --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: It stops at the Texas border.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Of course, I shouldn't ask about the federal government today anyway.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Well maybe I -- can I continue?

CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes, please.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: I think first of all I really appreciate the detailed analysis that was presented today. I think we've all got an excellent sort of basis to be able to respond to the concept as it develops.

The first thing that I would like to learn more about the next time we meet is views. And I think it would be helpful for us to understand how your sequencing the park and how you experience the park on bike or on foot or in a vehicle. Where the primary viewpoints are

and where you see those key destinations being. Because I think that will also help to orchestrate the actual experience and then the positioning of activities in the park so I look forward to seeing more details on that.

I think the second thing is there's been I think a very good presentation of the bike access opportunities. I think, though, it appears there's already great usage of the temporary ramp down from the Bridge. And it seems to me that that over the next six months as it is finished will actually start to show how much activity and how much interest there is of the tip of the park and that may start to suggest how -- whether it's formal or informal phasing. It may start to suggest how interim activities or other things can be phased into the park. I think that's a very important connection.

And then I think it's just -- the third comment I'd make is I'll look forward to seeing more, just more about the positioning of the primary park uses in balance with the -- with the bike trail access. I think in a park like this where access is so challenging it's easy to put all your focus onto the bike access. And I think it is just very important to keep it in balance with the park and the park areas so I'll look forward to seeing that.

And then I think the final point was just about the interim uses of buildings and programming of the buildings. I think that could be a critical way to see the park start to come to life. And it seems like it is already starting to come to life just because people are naturally going there and I think that's exciting to see that happen. So looking for ways to start to build that even perhaps ahead of a major injection of committed funding could be an exciting, you know, interim phase for the park.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: I did make one note, I'm sorry. There was one note about habitat. I look forward to learning more next time around of how the habitat areas are planned to be enhanced as part of the park.

CHAIR KRIKEN: We can deal with that when we get to the wildlife habitat.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Yes, yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I had comments on habitat stuff but I can wait until we get to that.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Gary, we skipped you, sorry.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Yes, I have a number of comments. I just want to say it's an incredible project and to work with all these different agencies and to come up with any plan at all seems like an amazing accomplishment so I think we all recognize that.

I think it's obvious to compare this to Crissy Field in some ways and I'm kind of interested to know, you know, what is the scale of this relative to Crissy Field? And although it's similar in a lot of ways it does seem like it's different in a lot of ways too. I think it's a good analogy but it can only go so far. You know, Crissy Field serves a lot more people in close proximity. And I think that when you think about how it gets programmed and so on I think it needs to find its own way.

We have seen on other projects that have been presented that there is a tendency to phase and divide and program and articulate. And the park is so amazing in itself that it is going to be a great destination, you know, just that it is being restored and made available. So I think it may be good not to jump to conclusions about how it might be programmed or what

sort of event or, you know, what specific thing might make it a destination. I think it's already a destination just, you know, like you say, just the fact that it's being improved.

So I guess I would love to see just like a big unifying idea and the more blending between these different parcels I would say, you know, the better. The Bridge Yard I can see being heavily programmed because it is in the more urban area. But as you get further out towards the water I don't know that it, you know, from my point of view that it would need to be programmed, you know, quite as heavily.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I think that was a good point that was raised right at the end, should it be more natural at the very tip as it goes into the Bay?

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Yeah. And when -- I don't know if this is a -- this is little --

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Even though there were some buildings there but it's still -- beyond that doesn't need any greater enhancement.

CHAIR KRIKEN: The next subject is proposed park amenities and we can really get into that next.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I guess I did get into it.

CHAIR KRIKEN: I recall in the plan there was a variety of those things for kids, things for -- high-thrill experiences and, you know, art and then of course food and beverage stops. Anyway, there's a lot of stuff being put out there. I think I don't have any answer but I do think they should, they should kind of get the framework set and

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I think less is more, actually.

CHAIR KRIKEN: And I do think that as well.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Gary brought up Crissy Field. You don't have all that going on at Crissy Field. You know, what you have is people utilizing the space and a few necessary amenities. A windsurfer building, the warming hut, now a display of some magnificent sculpture, but that's about it. I don't know if we need Ferris wheels and zip lines and things like that.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Right, right. I guess that's-- that would be my caution too, not to load it up with the expectation of hordes or children or some other idea that may not, fact, turn out in reality. And so there should be some way to sort of experiment or learn who comes to use it.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: That's what I think is the sort of saving -- short-term saving grace of the proposal, the sort of eclecticism that it has. I mean, all this isn't going to happen or it's not going to have it all. At the same time there is a real energy to it and it may just be the driver that's needed to have something actually happen here. But I do think there is that so there are these sort of potential beachheads of different kinds of use. But I think there is still at some point a valve that needs to be monitored so that it doesn't become so disparate that it's nowhere.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: I couldn't help noticing that out at the Point there is the tide pools, which is kind of an amazing idea. And it has these circular forms, which I couldn't help noticing that it kind of, you know, reminds me a little bit of --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: The tanks.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: EBMUD.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: You know, the East Bay MUD site.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Right.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: And so, I don't know, there is some association there. And I just wonder, you know, to get everybody else's take on that.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: It's like a Rorschach thing, isn't it, Gary?

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: There are associations with driving by that site for so many years.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Sort of windowing out again, this question of passive versus active. It's not just Crissy Field, it's sort of what's around the Bay. What percentages of passive and active and so forth are there? I don't know who studies that particularly. We don't do that, do we? BCDC doesn't keep track of sort of the facilities that touch the Bay and what the types of facilities are, what the percentages of passive and active are?

Because there is a certain -- I kind of keep going back to the word "energy" here that I think is good, that this area needs. Where that is on the meter of extreme, I don't know where that is but I think that it's really an important mix. Maybe it doesn't exist anywhere and if there is any place that could support it it might be some place like this, a site like this.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: There was some discussion about trees and I'm sort of of the mind that, you know, that trees are good. I know in a lot of circumstances, you know, we have recommended that there not be trees and preserve the industrial character of the waterfront. I think that in terms of enhancing views of the Bay that trees appropriately placed can actually enhance the views of the Bay and not block them.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Here they block the freeway and act as a sound --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Depending on your point of view, right?

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And maybe act as a sound wall, as opposed to some of the awful things that Caltrans puts up as sound walls.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: I worry about the trees having had projects on the Bay edge. This whole question of raptor so close to a biological reserve. I think we have to solve that question around the Bay. It stops a lot of trees from happening where they need to happen.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I was going to make that point too, actually.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Yeah, Roger, go ahead and deal with that.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Even tall art could be a raptor nest. When I look out at the shoreline I feel like there are certain areas that are sort of -- they have programmed for restoration. And you have to have sort of there hasn't really been what I think is well-thought out up front. The most natural thing here might be shore birds, in which case then you wouldn't want tall sculptures and statutes next to it.

And I think the shoreline, especially and I am very familiar with Radio Beach, you know, if you're going to sort of that's the program, sort of a restoration area around where that is then it has to be sort of a primary thought in those areas about what you're -- what kind of animals essentially you're going to get and then everything has to be sort of compatible with that.

Which also brings me to when we're going to talk about the fill and the cross-sections. But I definitely have a problem with the first cross-section. You build a steep retaining wall and then that actually has had negative consequences of washing out sandy beaches, so I think there is a -- I think the way the Bay ecology is going, this transition zone idea is what we're doing.

The idea is to look for natural analogues. So the reason I've been out there is when I did my beach job in Marin we surveyed here so I have actually data I could give you. And I think you could use that project in Marin as a design template for this.

So I think the actual cross-section would be you have a sandy part of the beach but you don't have the gravel part, which is typical for Bay beaches. And I think there is some combination of these that would actually get you that restoration but you might have to move the pathway back. So just along the lines of I tend to get maybe more in the design weeds but I think if that is going to be the restoration area that that should really be where the primary focus of that program -- I have a lot of ideas on the beach side. I think we could do that with less. It looks like fill but it would be a different -- it would be part of the whole design approach rather than fill with an edge of a wall and leading to the --

CHAIR KRIKEN: Would that be a site for sailboarding, the beach?

MS. KUEHL: It is now and it is recommended not to eliminate it.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Things like tide pools and such. And also I wonder about these terraces. It feels a little like these are ideas brought up and they have been incorporated, maybe designed by committee a little bit. And then now we have to put the -- somebody has to actually sit down there and figure out how it's going to work. And what's going to hold the terrace together? You know, if the rocks -- if it's creating an actual why would it stay over the wave attack? It's early stages in this is a really wonderful compilation of ideas but I think as the design goes forward along the shoreline edge things might fall out naturally anyway as being not really buildable or sustainable. That would be a concern that I have, that we try to build as natural in those areas that are programmed for that, as possible.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Could you restate the wildlife compatibility remark you made about high things.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah. So if you're -- this is a natural area for shore birds as we have in the Emeryville Crescent, that's what you get at the beaches. They love to come out and forage in the mud and in the sand. You know, Bay beaches have very muddy feet, so to speak, as opposed to coastal beaches. So if you have high towers, like Cheryl said, and tall art right next to it, you make raptor --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: And trees.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: You make raptor perches. They're going to swoop down. So typically they don't go together very well. We have to feed our raptors too but we don't want to --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Yeah, but I think that's the thing,

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: So it's all balanced.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: The raptors don't have a --

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Right.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: -- have support.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: So it's more along the lines of I think that these ideas are all in the early stages and as they go forward I think perhaps the habitat side, that the shoreline side needs to be brought in to the design a little stronger, you know, until we start fleshing out these components for the next go-round,

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: But I think that it would be great to hear more about that in the next go-round because you could see that submarining some of the things that you want to happen because they are very strong forces. We all here have experienced them.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Crissy Field is actually an interesting example of where they didn't really account for the sand so it closes off periodically.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Right.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: So there's, you know, there's a common example of a -- I don't think that's a question here, of course, not building a lagoon. But what you really need to understand when you're doing the shoreline work what's really going on in the actual processes in that area so you avoid the Crissy Field closures of the lagoon.

And then I think anywhere there's walls or structures or riprap within the Bay margin that's something of interest, I think, to us. Is it the minimum possible? I mean, we do -- those do get approved but to find out there's sea walls. I am really confused by the urban beach, that whole area, what it is exactly, as opposed to the other beach. So what's going on in the terracing urban beach area? A cross-section or two perhaps in there. More programming there or more understanding of what is proposed.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. I was wondering -- we should say something about the billboard problem. I think we -- I think we all here have some resistance to mass advertising of that kind and how it takes away one's focus in the context of where they are, which is arrival in Oakland and touching ground. And I think it's sort of like strip commercial, it's very negative environmental imagery. We could say that even though it is not literally a shoreline condition, but it is in some ways.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Are they more than 200 feet away from the shoreline?

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: It's a visual.

CHAIR KRIKEN: It's blocking the view from the highway to the outer views so it definitely does, it is our purview to make that comment.

I'd also wonder what you all think. When we first, when I first heard about this project I thought, at last we can plant some kind of visual screen to the sewage treatment plant, which is such a kind of a downer as you come into --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Well, maybe.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Any suggestions? Can we do that? Does it block views? Screening trees there, would that block other views?

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: I think it would call attention to it more.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Maybe so. Maybe that could be looked at just to see if there would be any possibility of taking the curse off that. Even though it's in an industrial area it's still -- it's just bringing this bridge and gateway to Oakland in the most positive, a sense of arrival to the city.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: It would be interesting to have a 10 year plan, a 20 year plan sort of to show. I know you have a phasing plan. I know there is a phasing plan but I think it would be interesting to see what the 100 year plan is. Just fast-forwarding over time, it doesn't have to be anything elaborate. And it's all crystal balling based on land availability and funding and so forth. But if there were an idea about the framework, you know, a sort of, what is the cohesive framework and how do the pieces hang on it over the years?

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Are you suggesting, John, that the work continue outside the site boundaries as they now are?

CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes, I guess. That there would be not necessarily in the name of the park but there would be plantings that would connect more of the freeway to the park, you might say. It kind of visually leads more strongly to the --

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Expand the scope of the master planting.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Can we say a few words about the East Span?

CHAIR KRIKEN: Oh, yes.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: I think it would be great to preserve it, a piece of it if we could. It seems like, you know, there's a lot of money to be saved by not demolishing it because that's expensive too. The question, I guess, is how it gets maintained and how it gets painted and all that kind of stuff. But I think it would be a great idea, I really support that.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: You mean the part that's the boardwalk or the --

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Just the reuse of some portion of the East Span for whatever use that might be.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I thought part of it was going to be an exhibit. I could be wrong.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: On land.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I think they want 288 feet, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: That's the 288s.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Two-eighty-eight, I think.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Yes.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Actually, I don't feel strongly myself that that's important to save. It's a -- it will be -- the metal will be reused in some other project, it's not like it's in a garbage dump or something. And I think that would be more meaningful than -- I mean, there could certainly be a model or photographs or other ways of recalling that time.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: And just to address a comment that was made. If the existing bridge that is coming down is unsafe seismically for automobile traffic I don't think it would be a wise thing to put housing there --

CHAIR KRIKEN: Right.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: -- in a seismic situation.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Back to --

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: Walking wouldn't be a problem.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: You want to walk on a bridge that might collapse under you?

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: I don't have -- I would like to see some analysis of what it would look like but I don't have such a strong view about keeping a part of the bridge. I think the, I think the combination of the pier with the new bridge is such a -- I mean, that could also be a very strong relationship.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I think it's one thing as a thought and a concept, the other is the physical reality, as you point out, what it looks like.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Yes, yes.

CHAIR KRIKEN: And it's got to be painted.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Well it's got to be blasted out and the lead has to come off of it first.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: They've got to change the deck.

CHAIR KRIKEN: But the idea of a pier, a fishing pier, is an attractive idea. It's a kind of passive, a passive activity there. Would you agree?

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: You're saying not necessarily associated with the bridge?

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: I would be interested to know how deep is the water where the pier would be proposed?

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: Are there fish there? That's pretty shallow at that point.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I think around that point they get --

CHAIR KRIKEN: I used to fish on the Berkeley pier when I was a little kid.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: But you went way, way out.

CHAIR KRIKEN: No I didn't.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: No?

CHAIR KRIKEN: It was in the shallow.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Keep you from walking all over the habitat.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: I used to fish off the muni pier at Aquatic Park. We could eat the fish in those days, I don't know about now.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Well, let's take stock here. Sea level rise.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I do have one. I think we're in this transition. I'd like to see the numbers, I guess. Because there's the new numbers that came out for the 100 year stillwater and they are about a foot higher. And so if you used the new numbers it feels like even by your analysis you'd get over-topping on a big -- because, you know, you even say that the waves are not included. So we do have the waves, especially with this exposure. So I guess it becomes a question of what happens to the trails if they get -- you know, it's the storms that wash everything out.

And so the way people have been going, they have been building for like 2030 but with enough room to raise it up as they need to over the future. Like the new Alameda -- the new Alameda Point EIR plan would be higher than this, these numbers. I guess I could see these trails getting washed out. Do we want to start that way or at least maybe have ability to raise it at some point later. Because I think you've got a 2050 number of a foot without wave action, which I think is kind of on the low side of what people are looking at now.

BOARD MEMBER STRANG: Given the amount of fill that it would take, that's shown on the drawings anyway, I mean, why not just go higher right from the start.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah. Or have a higher base that allows you to kind of bring in fill at a later date. So I don't know what numbers you've been using. Maybe Brad knows probably more than me what people are doing. But I know Treasure Island and Alameda Point, they would -- I mean, they were trying to keep people out of the FEMA maps, which is not a bad thing if you have any structures. I don't know if you do. Because the insurance rates are going up and up. So to do that you would need to be higher than this, I can tell you that.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. Looking at the list, everybody, is there anything that one might add to what we have discussed so far?

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: I think there was a point about, a comment about the connection to Radio Beach and whether that park connection is desirable.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: That didn't bother me going under the freeway. I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: My point of view about a park like this is as many connections as you can get you should try and make.

CHAIR KRIKEN: At least where I have seen under the Bridge it's beautiful. That causeway is a piece of sculpture all by itself. Whoever thought a causeway would be great? I certainly didn't.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: You did mention Audubon may have concerns with it, I don't know what those would be, or specifically I don't know.

MR. McCREA: The concern is not only the filling of the tidal pools that you talked about but it's also getting -- when you get to the marsh. I believe there's endangered species at the Crescent itself. So it's the old issue of public access and wildlife --

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Right, okay, yeah. So I think we'd be a good, you know. I'm sure you know, probably the minimum. Will that get it away? And also create a visual barrier. Because I think the birds are fine with cars. I mean, I used to go to the Emeryville Crescent all the time. I think it's the people walking that tend to flush them out.

CHAIR KRIKEN: All right, hearing no additions.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: It's a great plan.

CHAIR KRIKEN: May I ask if you have everything you need?

MS. MIRAMONTES: Well, We should run through the issues here. I think you commented on the physical access. You mentioned wanting a bit more of an understanding of how people would get there.

In terms of visual access. And Jacinta, you mentioned wanting to understand the primary views within the park, better.

And park amenities, you liked the idea of an active and passive mix. You wanted there to be an opportunity for experimentation with the program over time. And there seemed to be general feeling that more passive at the Point; greater, heavier program at the Bridge Yard. And the fishing pier, I guess you have a variety of opinions on keeping the 288 but the idea of a fishing pier was attractive it sounded like.

CHAIR KRIKEN: But there was some, some negative feelings about keeping the bridge.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Right, okay.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: But also some positive feelings.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR KRIKEN: What?

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: But also some positive feelings about keeping it. I don't know, you know.

BOARD MEMBER BARTON: We're mixed.

BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH: It could be awful, it could be great.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay, so mixed on the 288.

I guess you didn't speak about water access. That was one of the issues we raised but it wasn't discussed so much either, just wildlife compatibility issues.

CHAIR KRIKEN: But fishing and sailboarding and --

BOARD MEMBER McCANN: Kayaks.

MS. MIRAMONTES: But the idea about it be a part of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail. So considering that wildlife compatibility, whether greater in the Emeryville Crescent, you know, greater impacts there potentially. Navigational safety issues, things like that.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: I'd like to see the access to Radio Beach be as minimal as needed. I don't know what that is, you know. Obviously that's a tradeoff.

MS. MIRAMONTES: So I'm sorry, Roger.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: You asked if a new trail is appropriate at Radio Beach. I mean, that's always -- that's a tradeoff I don't know that we -- you could all weigh in but I would say as minimal as needed.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Minimal necessary,

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Yeah, because that's been programmed the wildlife area. They kicked everybody out of the Emeryville Crescent. I mean, I used to go out there in high school and build sculptures. I know. A keg of beer and we'd be out there. But they got everyone out of there because of the birds so you can't do that anymore and so I think this would be along those lines. You know, as little as possible human access out to that area.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Right, okay. And I don't know if you -- so minimal the size of the trail, concerned about tall elements on that side for raptors.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Moving it in closer so there is less fill or less need for a retaining wall. Probably save the project some money anyway.

MS. MIRAMONTES: And avoiding, and you spoke about avoiding riprap and retaining walls wherever possible.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Sea walls.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Sea walls. And sea level rise. There's comments about needing to go higher.

BOARD MEMBER LEVENTHAL: Or checking the numbers and making sure that what other people are doing. And that they have the ability to raise in the future if the number is worse than people think.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Ellie, would you say that addresses most of the issues raised?

MS. KNECHT: Yes.

MS. MIRAMONTES: And Brad, do you think there is anything missing that we wanted them to cover?

MR. McCREA: I think we heard it all.

(Laughter.)

MS. MIRAMONTES: So I think you covered many of the, many of the points.

CHAIR KRIKEN: We could then, if we satisfied that, can we -- would the applicant like to respond?

MR. FREMIER: Yeah, let me actually speak real quickly because I do appreciate the time and effort. Brad and I were just commenting and it sounds like -- your meeting here sounds like our meetings. We're debating a lot of the same things. I'm really appreciative of the input

and I think over the course of the next six months to a year we are going to be able to come back with a lot of answers to the questions. Because we're addressing them, I think, in similar ways. We have the same kinds of puts and takes that we have to answer. We certainly are very concerned about the relationship with the park district and making sure what we develop is sustainable. Plus the Caltrans folks in the back are already building some things out there that we have to also interface with the conversation so we do look forward to the dialogue.

CHAIR KRIKEN: Well thank you very much and it's a wonderful project.

(Applause.)

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.)

--oOo--

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Ramona Cota, a Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting; that I thereafter transcribed it.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting or in any way interested in the outcome of said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of October, 2013.

/s/ Ramona Cota.
RAMONA COTA, CERT*478